## 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA 2 ROLANDO CAMUNAS, 3 Case No.: 2:21-cv-01005-ER Plaintiff, 4 5 v. 6 NATIONAL REPUBLICAN AMENDED COMPLAINT AND SENATORIAL COMMITTEE, **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** 7 Defendant. 8 9 AMENDED COMPLAINT 10 ROLANDO CAMUNAS ("Plaintiff"), by and through his attorneys, KIMMEL & 11 SILVERMAN, P.C., alleges the following against NATIONAL REPUBLICAN SENATORIAL 12 COMMITTEE ("Defendant" or "NRSC"): 13 **INTRODUCTION** 14 1. Plaintiff's Amended Complaint is based on the Telephone Consumer Protection 15 Act ("TCPA"), 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq. 16 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE** 17 18 2. Jurisdiction of this Court arises pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331. See Mims v. 19 Arrow Fin. Services, LLC, 132 S. Ct. 740, 747, 181 L. Ed. 2d 881 (2012). 20 3. Defendant conducts business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. 21 4. Plaintiff resides in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. 22 5. The acts and omissions described herein occurred primarily in the 23 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. 24 6. Accordingly, personal jurisdiction is established. 25

- 19. Despite the fact that Plaintiff's cell phone number had been registered on the Do Not Call list since 2015, and despite the fact that Plaintiff never consented for the NRSC to call or text him, Defendant placed a series of harassing and intrusive calls seeking to raise money for political candidates in or around September 2020.
- 20. Specifically, Defendant sent text messages to Plaintiff's cell phone for the purpose of soliciting campaign donations at dates/times including but not limited to:
  - 09/09/2020 at 6:43 pm EST;
  - 09/10/2020 at 1:57 pm EST;
  - 09/12/2020 at 2:37 pm EST;
  - 09/15/2020 at 5:57 pm EST;
  - 09/17/2020 at 4:11 pm EST; and
  - 09/18/2020 at 1:47 pm EST.
  - 21. Defendant's text messages were generic and obviously pre-written.
- 22. On NRSC's website, the organization concedes that its communications are "recurring autodialed marketing messages." (*See* Ex. A, Printout from NRSC's webpage, p. 6 ("By participating, you agree to the terms & privacy policy (55404-info.com) for recurring autodialed marketing messages from NRSC to the phone number you provide.")<sup>1</sup>
- 23. Accordingly, the text messages qualify as "calls with a pre-recorded voice" and calls made with an automatic telephone dialing system under the TCPA.
- 24. Plaintiff found the calls to be annoying, disruptive, frustrating and an invasion of his privacy.
  - 25. The actions described herein were in violation of the TCPA.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Again, Plaintiff did not consent to receiving the aforementioned text messages from NRSC prior to the NRSC's issuance of said text messages.

## 

## COUNT I Defendants Violated the TCPA 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)

- 26. Plaintiff incorporates the forgoing paragraphs as though the same were set forth at length herein.
- 27. The TCPA prohibits placing calls or text messages using an automatic telephone dialing system or automatically generated or prerecorded voice to a cellular telephone except where the caller has the prior express consent of the called party to make such calls or where the call is made for emergency purposes. 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).
- 28. Because a text is a "call' under the TCPA, by logical extension, a text with a prewritten script is a "call with a pre-recorded voice" under the statute.
  - 29. Defendant sent to Plaintiff text messages with pre-written script.
- 30. Upon information and belief, Defendant uses dialing technology, which calls phone numbers from a stored list using a random or sequential number generator to select those phone numbers.
- 31. Here, Defendant initiated multiple text messages to Plaintiff's cellular telephone number using an automatic telephone dialing system.
  - 32. Defendant's texts were not made for "emergency purposes."
- Defendant's texts to Plaintiff's cellular telephones without any prior express consent.
- Defendant contacted Plaintiff despite the fact that Plaintiff has been on the Do Not Call Registry.

- 24. Defendant's acts as described above were done with malicious, intentional, willful, reckless, wanton and negligent disregard for Plaintiff's rights under the law and with the purpose of harassing Plaintiff.
- 25. The acts and/or omissions of Defendant were done unfairly, unlawfully, intentionally, deceptively and fraudulently and absent bona fide error, lawful right, legal defense, legal justification or legal excuse.
- 26. As a result of the above violations of the TCPA, Plaintiff has suffered the losses and damages as set forth above entitling Plaintiff to an award of statutory, actual and trebles damages.

## COUNT II Defendant Violated the TCPA 47 U.S.C. § 227(C)

- 27. Plaintiff incorporates the forgoing paragraphs as though the same were set forth at length herein.
- 28. The TCPA prohibits any person or entity of initiating any telephone solicitation to a residential telephone subscriber who has registered his or his telephone number on the National Do-Not-Call Registry of persons who do not wish to receive telephone solicitations that is maintained by the Federal Government. 47 U.S.C. § 227(c).
- Defendant contacted Plaintiff despite the fact that Plaintiff has been on the Do
   Not Call Registry since 2015.
- 30. Defendant's acts as described above were done with malicious, intentional, willful, reckless, wanton and negligent disregard for Plaintiff's rights under the law and with the purpose of harassing Plaintiff.

- 31. The acts and/or omissions of Defendant were done unfairly, unlawfully, intentionally, deceptively and fraudulently and absent bona fide error, lawful right, legal defense, legal justification or legal excuse.
- 32. As a result of the above violations of the TCPA, Plaintiff has suffered the losses and damages as set forth above entitling Plaintiff to an award of statutory, actual and trebles damages.

Wherefore, Plaintiff, ROLANDO CAMUNAS, respectfully prays for judgment as follows:

- a. All actual damages Plaintiff suffered (as provided under 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A));
- b. Statutory damages of \$500.00 per violative telephone call (as provided under 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B));
- c. Additional statutory damages of \$500.00 per violative telephone call (as provided under 47 U.S.C. § 227(C);
- d. Treble damages of \$1,500.00 per violative telephone call (as provided under 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3));
- e. Additional treble damages of \$1,500.00 per violative telephone call (as provided under 47 U.S.C. § 227(C);
- f. Injunctive relief (as provided under 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3) and (c); and
- g. Any other relief this Honorable Court deems appropriate.

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** 1 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, ROLANDO CAMUNAS, demands a jury trial 2 in this case. 3 4 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED, 5 6 7 By: /s/ Jacob U. Ginsburg DATED: 04/16/2021 Amy L. Bennecoff Ginsburg, Esq. 8 Jacob U. Ginsburg, Esq. Kimmel & Silverman, P.C. 9 30 East Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002 10 Phone: (215) 540-8888 ext. 104 Facsimile: (877) 788-2864 11 Email: aginsburg@creditlaw.com iginsburg@creditlaw.com 12 teamkimmel@creditlaw.com 13 14 15 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 16 17 I, Jacob U. Ginsburg, hereby certify that on April 16, 2021 a true and correct copy of the foregoing Amended Complaint was served on all parties of record via ECF. 18 19 20 /s/ Jacob U. Ginsburg 21 22 23 24 25